

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,490,717 B1 to Pedersen, et al. (“Pedersen”). Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner indicated that claims 22-24 are allowed and claims 3-6, 8-15, and 17-21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations off the base claim and any intervening claims. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 16-24, have rewritten claim 6 as independent, and have canceled claim 2 but have not added any claim. Accordingly, claims 1, and 3-24 will be pending in the application after entry of this Amendment.

I. Amendment to the Specification and Drawings

In this Amendment, Applicants have corrected four typographical errors in the drawings and three typographical errors in the specification. No new matter had been added, as all the corrections are supported by the discussion in the specification and by the illustrations in the figures. Specifically, Applicants moved a “From 615” transitional arrow that previously pointed to operation 660 in the flowchart illustrated in Figure 6B to now point to the operation 655. This change is supported by (1) the referenced transition from 615 to 655 in Figure 6A, (2) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 5-7, and (3) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 8-22, which provides the rationale as to why the process 600 of Figure 6 transitions to 655 from 615 and 645.

Applicants also corrected the description of the operation 1445 in Figure 14. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 51, lines 15-17. In addition, Applicants added a “From 2242” transitional arrow to operation 2228 on Figure 22B. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 72, lines 14-15.

Applicants also corrected the numbering of operation 2246 in Figure 22C. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 72, lines 19-20.

In the specification on page 31, Applicants changed an inaccurate reference to a transition from 615 to 660 in Figure 6B, to an accurate reference regarding a transition from 615 to 655. As mentioned above, this change is supported by (1) the referenced transition from 615 to 655 in Figure 6A, (2) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 5-7, and (3) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 8-22, which provides the rationale as to why the process 600 of Figure 6 transitions to 655 from 615 and 645.

On page 72, line 13, Applicants have also changed "2242" to "2202." This is a reference number for the operation that the process 2200 of Figures 22A-22C performs to generate several graphs. As mentioned in the specification on page 65, line 1 to page 66, line 16, the process 2200 generates these graphs at 2202. *See also* page 70, lines 15-17. Finally, on page 73, lines 2-3, Applicants have changed "[a]fter 2244, the process ends," to "[a]fter 2246, the process ends." As shown in Figure 22C, the process 2200 ends after it completes the database tables; as specified in the specification, the process 2200 completes the database tables at 2246, which proceeds 2244 in Figure 22C. *See* page 72, lines 19-20.

II. Abstract Objection

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the abstract as exceeding the 150 word limit. The specification has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's objection. Specifically, the abstract has been amended so as to not exceed the 150 word limit.

III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, and 22 for informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that after review of the Examiner's comments

concerning claim 9, it appears that the Examiner intended to require the correction to claim 10. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended claim 10, and claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 16, 17, and 22 as suggested by the Examiner. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, and 22.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 7

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 7 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Pedersen. The Examiner stated that claims 3-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Specifically, the Examiner stated that those claims are allowed because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest generating each encoded node representation includes specifying a node identifier that specifies the start of an encoded description of an encoded node in combination with other limitations as recited in claims 3 and 5. Accordingly, Applicants have canceled claim 2 and amended claims 1 and 3 so that claims 1 and 3 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the previously presented claim language makes it clear that in claim 1, and claim 6, as amended, a graph that has one node for each circuit element of a sub-network and the encoded representation of the graph do not refer to circuit schematics. Rather, the graph of claim 1 refers to an encoded representation of a sub-network in which the representation has nodes, and node identifiers. However, in the interest of expeditious prosecution, and for reasons of clarification, not for reasons of patentability, applicant has amended claim 1, to add “said generating comprises generating an encoded representation of each node, wherein generating the encoded representation of each node includes specifying a node identifier that specifies the start of an encoded description of the encoded node”, after

“generating an encoded representation of the graph”. Applicants do not surrender any equivalents of the amended limitations.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not render amended claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 3-15 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and 3-15 as amended, are patentable over Pedersen. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 7 and objections to claims 3-6 and 8-15.

V. Rejection of Claim 16

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Pedersen. Claims 17-21 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 16. The Examiner stated that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Specifically, the Examiner stated that those claims are allowed because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest generating each encoded node representation includes specifying a node identifier that specifies the start of an encoded description of an encoded node in combination with other limitations as recited in claims 17-21. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 17 so that claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not render amended claim 16 unpatentable. As claims 17-21 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 16, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-21, as amended, are patentable over Pedersen. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claim 16 and objections to claims 17-21.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 1, and 3-24, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

This Amendment is submitted with a petition and fee for a two month extension of time. Accordingly, Applicants believe no additional fee is required. However, in the unlikely event that the Patent Office determines that additional fees, extension, and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or fees due in connection with the filing of this document, or to credit any overpayment, to **Deposit Account: 50-1128** referencing docket: SPLX.P0095. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 12/12/05


Ali Makoui

Reg. No. 45,536

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1050
Century City, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x301
Fax: (310) 785-9558

Amendments to the Drawings:

Attached are four sheets of drawings that include changes to Figures 6B, 14, 22B, and 22C. These sheets replace the original four sheets that included Figures 6B, 14, 22B, and 22C. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the amended drawings.